

ANCIENT WISDOM

A monthly journal devoted to teaching theosophical and occult truths

"There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy."—Hamlet

VOLUME XVIII

FEBRUARY, 1953—SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI

NUMBER 12

MEAT-EATING AND THE GROUP SOUL

Another Point Of View

By PETER E. KOOPMAN, M. D.
(With A Reply By The Editor)

You could not have selected a better time to ask me, if I felt inclined to give my opinion about Mr. Alferd Anderson's article titled "*Meat-eating and the group soul*" because today it is "Animal Protection Day" in remembrance of Francis of Assisi, who was born October 4, thus almost right in the center of LIBRA, the most balanced sign of the zodiac.

To start with, it certainly is true that Hindus and Buddhists are from ages back vegetarians, as you stated, but that does not mean that the Europeans and Americans cannot follow the same path.

Nothing is said in article of Mr. Anderson about the cruelty connected with the slaughtering of all those animals. The experience only is mentioned that those pigs get as group souls out of that six months incarnation. I wonder how much they really get out of that six months when human beings living at least fifty to eighty years accumulate so little wisdom, although their comprehension is certainly far above the degenerated dulled pig. The wild boar is much more alert than that so-called modernized product we can see at farms and stockyards.

Add to this the tremendous lowering of the human mind by eating dead pigs, cows and sheep with the natural consequence of a thousand-and-one diseases followed by untold suffering, and the so-called benefit for the pig, *EVEN IF TRUE*, is so insignificant and logically out of proportion that any such argument ought to be discarded.

I dare say also that if the fifty percent meat eating Theosophists had to kill the animals they eat, they would refrain from doing so. Which reminds me of a story I read some years ago about Count Leo Tolstoy, who narrated that his aunt was one day visiting him and as he knew she was very fond of chickens he had tied a live chicken to the leg of her chair in the dining room. He had put a large butcher knife near her plate telling her that, if she wanted chicken, she had to kill it herself. Needless to say the chicken was not killed by his aunt.

The food question is really the most important subject there is. It is here where the great prevention of all the

(Continued on Page 95)

THE THREE QUALITIES AND THE PATH

By ERNEST WOOD

Through the numerous translations of the Bhagavad Gita, and the frequent comments upon it and references to its teachings, many people have become acquainted with the classification of the various contents of the world into three kinds, as material, energetic and orderly.

It is a thoroughly scientific division. Every student of elementary science is taught in the beginning of his course that he is to learn about matter, energy and natural law. This shows us how basic the classification is.

Let us adopt into our language for common use the three adjectives *tamasic*, *rajasic* and *sattwic*, and we shall soon see what a speeding up of thought we get from these simple verbal gadgets.

A fat, lazy, sluggish human body is called *tamasic*. A restless one is called *rajasic*. "Yond Cassius hath a lean and hungry look," would have been put in one word by the Hindu thinker—he is *rajasic*. Similarly, a mountain is material or *tamasic*, a tornado is *rajasic* or restless, a smiling country scene where there is a little stream, grass in the fields, some trees and cows, and gently moving clouds—everything in its proper place—is *sattwic* or orderly. Organic bodies, such as the human body or a printing machine, also show *sattwa*. They have no unnecessary parts and all their parts are harmoniously related together, so that there is harmony of the parts and unity of the whole. The same may be said of a good picture or a good piece of statuary or music, or a good mind.

The three terms are always invested with a moral signification. *Sattwa* is "good" as well as "orderly." It is also "intelligent"—so the one word instantly connotes the presence of those three ideals. The word *sattwic* also carries with it a flavor of approval. *Tamasic* and *rajasic* things are disapproved in their respective ways.

Readers of the ANCIENT WISDOM will no doubt be most interested in the application of this idea to human life. The highest achievement is to make our five constituent "principles" all *sattwic*. This also gives the greatest happiness—to the individual concerned and to all those who have to deal with him or her. The five "principles" are:

SPIRITUAL: Will to fulfill life.
ETHICAL: Feeling towards life.

(Continued on Page 95)

WHY ABNORMAL PERSONALITIES?

By CHARLES E. LUNTZ

I.

Occultism, which has an explanation *in principle* for every untoward occurrence in life should surely be able to account for the weird cases of personality gone berserk with which the record books are filled. Note we say that Occultism has an explanation *in principle*, not in detail. There are too many details—hundreds of them, thousands of them—to have a ready-made answer to the specific problem each presents. But, as in all branches of the occult philosophy, by applying a basic principle to the particular case, the over-all answer may be deduced though exact causes may still remain obscure.

We might first get clear in mind exactly what is meant by "abnormal." The dictionary definition is "not conforming to rule; deviating from type or standard." This is a pretty broad definition and if literally applied might take in almost everybody, for in some form or other the conduct of nearly everyone departs from the norm. Psychologists declare, in fact, that each person has his little quirks, foibles and eccentricities which are not common to the rest—is a bit "off" in some particular or particulars, great or small.

This is certainly to be expected as our evolution is only at about the halfway mark.

But the personality with which our present inquiry will deal is *really* abnormal and his "behavior pattern," as the psychologists term it, deviates widely from the average. We are not here concerned with individual case histories or diagnoses, nor with the medical reasons for these aberrations. Our exploration goes deeper. And whether the abnormality is in the field of alcoholism, sex, inability to adjust oneself to life, mental disturbance, cruelty or any other of the myriad forms it may take, it is the occult and not the overt which is the subject of our examination.

The discussion may be divided into three parts: (1) Why does the abnormality now exist? (2) Can it be eliminated in this incarnation? (3) If carried forward to the next, how long must it go on and how and when will it ever be cured?

At the outset it may well be asked, does "soul-age" have anything to do with it? Are young souls more likely to be abnormal than old or middle-aged

(Continued on Page 95)

ANCIENT WISDOM

FOUNDED BY L. W. ROGERS

published monthly at

320 Merchants' Exchange Bldg.

St. Louis 2, Mo.

CHARLES E. LUNTZ, Editor

ANCIENT WISDOM PRESS, Publishers

Entered as second-class matter Sept. 25, 1936, at the post office at St. Louis, Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscriptions: 1 year \$2.00; 6 months \$1.20; Canada and abroad, 1 year \$2.50.

Single Copies, 20 cents

WHAT IS "JUSTICE"?

In reading the effusions of some of the religious writers, we have been struck by the loose way in which they use the word "justice"—particularly what they term "divine justice"—as though it were some sort of commodity, packaged, labeled, and conforming to a trade standard. We wonder how they can be so sure of their definition and the things they apply it to, in view of the fact that "justice," so called, may differ completely in one country from what it is in another, in one state as against another, in one city as compared with another, or even in different courtrooms in the same city or the same building. Sometimes the same courtroom may witness differing brands of "justice" on different days.

Which is not disparaging either laws or judges but which does point the fact that the word is subject to many interpretations where human justice is concerned. How then can fallible man, if we may be pardoned for inferring that religious writers are fallible, be so sure that he knows what Divine Justice is or is not? We are all acquainted with the not very intellectual specimen who on hearing that someone he (or she) dislikes has met with misfortune exclaims, "It's a judgment on him!" Meaning of course a Divine Judgment. Considerable presumption, we would say. And karma has a nasty habit of catching up with those who gloat over the unhappiness of their neighbors, deserved or undeserved.

We used the word deserved advisedly, well knowing that the customary reaction in Theosophy is, "Nothing can happen to you that you don't deserve." We think the word is out of place in relation to what happens to anyone, appropriate as it may seem from a lower point of view. It gets back to the old idea of rewards and punishments—reward for being "good," punishment for being "bad," as though these two states also were capable of precise definition. A clergyman describing a member of his congregation as a "good" man, would certainly not mean the same as the man's employer, using exactly the same phrase. A man with two wives is assuredly a bad man in this country and in our day. He was perfectly moral and even "beloved of the Lord" in Bible

times, and he might have two dozen. There are countries today in the East where this still holds.

So that goodness or badness are purely relative terms, as is justice, and so long as the thinking is conditioned by indoctrination which has fashioned these words into descriptions of absolutes, the theosophical concept, as we see it, has not quite been grasped. Suffering is no easier to take because it is branded karma instead of punishment or justice. If we merely substitute one term for another—a Sanskrit word for an English one—what advantage is gained?

Does not a Hitler deserve punishment? may be asked, thereby again showing complete misunderstanding of the point at issue. A Hitler needs to be educated out of his Hitlerian ways. Karma will do that job effectively, no doubt over many painful lives. What we call punishment will be present all right in full measure. What we call justice also. But karma is quite impersonal about it. "It knows not wrath nor pardon." Education is called for, and that type of education must necessarily involve great and prolonged suffering. But even for a Hitler the education, not the suffering, not the "justice," is the prime—the only—consideration. The notion that somehow the Divine must measure out a certain amount of punishment or justice (same thing in the minds of many people) in return for a given amount of "badness" is very small-bore reasoning. Especially as the "badness," according to some sects, may consist of such trivialities as not going to church or not believing in this, that or the other absurdity labeled a dogma or doctrine, of which two-thirds of the human race have never even heard.

When one accepts karma—which means whatever happens—as benevolent education and ignores completely both the justice and the punishment (or reward) angle, one is getting on a bit in evolution. Or so it appears to us. It shouldn't be so hard. We talk of "learning from experience," by which we nearly always mean unpleasant experience or "punishment." Can't we transcend these piffling little ideas that trace to a former age which must have its beliefs simple to the point of morosity? We are growing up a little by now—at least we should have outgrown our spiritual adolescence. Theosophical concepts are for those who are approaching something of spiritual maturity.

Don't be content with the superficialities which in the average mind pass for thinking on these subjects. Try to get to the bottom of them. It's worth the try even though one may not hope fully to succeed. But to gain even a partial understanding of what life is about merits the deep thought that is necessary before its meaning begins to dawn. And that is a good deal more than a nodding assent to what one has read in books or heard at lectures. In-

tellectual acceptance of a truth is far removed from living the truth. That takes *spiritual* acceptance, though intellectual acceptance may pave the way.

"Justice!" "Punishment!" "Reward!"—all misnomers. Merge them into the one word *Education*, and you have something—something to live by and with. Something that won't disappoint you, won't frighten you, won't let you down. Others may continue to ask despairingly, "Why do things happen as they do?" but you won't. You will know.

HOW TO MAKE THEOSOPHY LOOK RIDICULOUS

Theosophy, since its introduction to the Western world three-quarters of a century ago, has been an object of derision to the unthinking. We say unthinking, because even if the deriders hold college degrees or occupy professorial chairs in the Universities, they are unthinking in their scorn for a cosmic philosophy which, properly understood, commands the highest reverence in the thinking.

The Theosophist does not allow his feelings to be hurt by this ridicule, which has been the lot of every advance in human intellection. But, if he is wise, he will not wish to contribute to it by making or endorsing witless statements at which even his brother Theosophists may well smile—or wince.

This sentiment is evoked by receipt of a letter from a T. S. member which among other things informs us that at a recent Lodge meeting the class leader "held forth on the doctrine of harmlessness." This is the Hindu ethical principle of *Ahimsa* or non-injury which, as our correspondent remarks, is in itself laudable and entirely theosophical. We quote from his letter:

"However, we heard that we should remove all mice *alive* from our buildings and block their means of entry for the future by means of screened windows, etc. The class leader further praised the virtues of the Hindu Jain sect who, on crossing a place abounding in insects, would take hours to do so, being very careful not to injure their little brothers by their passing. Also, should they find themselves 'inhabited'—and I'll bet there are few who aren't—would very carefully and considerately remove the little rascal and deposit him tenderly on the ground. (He omitted to say if it was the custom to call a friend to sit and visit for awhile, to the end that the forlorn little creature might get a new home).

Anyway, those people were held up as a criterion of conduct, and it was almost too much. Read the history of Europe, the middle East and Asia—of the plague, bubonic, typhus and other epidemic scourges of mankind. Read how the populations of Italy, France, Germany and England were decimated—

how those able to do so fled London only to die in their castles and country retreats—how the 'dead wagons' picked up corpses from every block of every street. Read that those plagues have killed more than all man's foolish wars, have retarded progress and contributed to the prolongation of the Dark Ages. Then read that the agent that spread those horrors was the aforesaid little body parasite and the equally small blood-sucking insect harbored by rats. Then consider the above-mentioned maudlin sentimentalism and see if you aren't slightly nauseated. I haven't been back."

Our reaction is, how stupid can one get in presenting Theosophy? We suggest an even more brilliant notion, strictly in line with the benevolent protection of rats, mice and other noxious vermin and bugs. What about our younger brothers the microbes? Have not *they* the right to live? What business have we, when we are sick, trying to find remedies to destroy the bacteria that otherwise would destroy us? And our younger sister, the filthy disgusting housefly, that lays thousands of eggs to hatch out more germ-carrying progeny, how dare we interfere with her maternal duties by brutally swatting her?

Suppose a female mosquito, seeking for her children the most desirable food (for a young mosquito) human blood, was to settle on the ankle of the exponent of harmlessness while he was expounding his theory. Surely he would not be so inconsiderate as to shoo it away or—Heavens!—even try to slap the life out of it. Young mosquitos must live, must they not?

A *reductio ad absurdum*?—of course. But how else can one deal with such twaddle, well calculated to dissolve all interest in Theosophy in a gale of raucous laughter?

"I haven't been back" writes our reader, and all we can reply is, "No wonder!"

For heaven's sake—for Theosophy's sake—let us use a little common sense in our classwork, our lectures and our literature. Else we have only ourselves and our ineptness to blame if the thinking people—the *thinking* people—to whom we would fain appeal, shy away from us in horror at the thought of identifying themselves with rat and mice and insect protectors.

As a Society we are 77 years old. We should try to be our age.

HAPPY ACCIDENT

In the plethora of atheistic literature which descends on us monthly unasked, we are struck by the insistence on the alleged fact that man is an accident. Nature, after millions of aeons of pushing and shoving matter around in various combinations, finally hit on the right one (or was it the wrong one?) and produced life. Understand, nature didn't intend to produce it, didn't know

she was producing it. It just happened, as it was bound to happen, given enough time for chance to experiment blindly with every conceivable type of combination.

Once life was present, it was only a matter of more aeons, more combinations, more blind pushing and pulling, before man was evolved. But no one "behind the scenes" knows anything about him, in fact there is no behind the scenes. He was just an accident like everything else that exists.

Being an accident, he has nothing to hope for when his little accidental life is finished. Hopes, ideals, aspirations—all foolishness! Let him do what he may to lighten the lot of his brother accidents—let him live out his minute spot of accident as helpfully and pleasantly as he can—and then . . . pouff! Good-bye Accident! Back to the nothingness you came from.

A truly charming philosophy and one to appeal to great intellects. That great intellects (Bertrand Russell, for instance) hold such a philosophy is a curious demonstration of the capacity of the human mind to ignore fundamentals and reason from superficial appearances. The wonder of the natural order with its extraordinary adaptation of means to ends in a million, a billion, a trillion different ways, is all . . . accident, chance, fortuity. A something called eternal law is admitted but no one administers it. It just works sightlessly, aimlessly, without will or purpose, without intelligence, without care for the creatures its blind meanderings have called into existence.

All this may satisfy the materialists, though how they can be satisfied with a theory so colossally stupid is hard to understand. Yet they charge with stupidity those who challenge their dreary belief—who insist that in a world teeming with intelligence there must be an over-all Intelligence responsible for it. But no! There is no intelligence about it. Man is an accident.

A sad accident, we would say, if he falls for this poorly reasoned conclusion—and why not? Nothing to live for, nothing to die for. Just one of a myriad tiny bubbles that no one even blew.

Some years ago, after hearing this bleak philosophy expounded by a brilliant professor of English Literature, we asked him if he was satisfied with it. "No," he admitted, "but it is the only one to which I can concede validity." But why, when the greatest scientific minds confess that with all our knowledge of the properties of matter pushed right back to the electron, we know virtually nothing of what constitutes mind and less than that of the mysterious thing called life—why must anyone, how can anyone, be so sure that matter (or energy) alone is eternal, mind and life ephemeral?

Isn't that putting the cart before the horse—mistaking the unimportant (relatively) for the important? Can it be that in the scheme of things the dull,

inert matter which mind so brilliantly fashions and employs is all that is preserved, while the mentality that has mastered and used it perishes without trace? It seems to us that the folly of the question provides its own answer . . . it cannot be!

If man is indeed an accident, with all his shortcomings what a happy accident he is! Nature, blindly stumbling, hit by chance on amazing combinations of her atoms and electrons that certainly did an extraordinary job of masquerading as Super-intelligence even though in reality it was only a seeming—just an appearance of intelligence caused by a jumble of molecules that all-unknown stamped out man.

Does this make sense to you? It does apparently to the materialist, though how such a thing is possible is beyond us. He must be endowed with a very special type of mind with a huge capacity for ignoring not only the evidence of intuition, of which he seemingly has none, but the evidence of the senses of which he is so proud.

So as one happy accident to another, may we congratulate ourselves on having—perhaps after many lives—evolved the intuitions and the mind that steer us clear of these senseless materialistic pitfalls that must make life a burden to these people no matter how much they may deceive themselves into a belief that they are enjoying it. Other lives are before them too, though they laugh at the notion, and these lives will one day bring to them the peace of mind, the clarity of understanding and the uplift of spirit that perhaps the informed Theosophist alone may know.

NO PROBLEM

A "difficulty," which is no difficulty at all when understood, but which seems to bother some inquirers into the truth of reincarnation, is this:

The population of the earth varies from age to age and even from generation to generation. This variation may be anything from several millions to a billion or more. Bang goes the idea of rebirth! What about those extra—or scant—souls for the bodies?

We have not included this solemn question in our series, "Real Problems of Reincarnation," because it is not a problem at all and once the rationale of our repeated returns to earth is grasped the alleged problem vanishes into thin air.

There are now some two billion, three hundred million people inhabiting this planet. Obviously they need two billion, three hundred million Egos to ensoul them. (This is a crude way of putting it, but the entire argument is crude, so we will let it pass).

Now if death and re-ensoulment were simultaneous processes—say 2:00 A.M. dead; 2:00:01 A.M. reborn—as some confused believers in reincarnation think, and as the present writer used to think before he contacted Theosophy

(Continued on Page 93)

THE OCCULT INTERPRETATION OF OMAR KHAYYAM

Foolish Prophets?

BY CHARLES E. LUNTZ

XXV

Why, all the Saints and Sages who
discuss'd
Of the Two Worlds so learnedly, are
thrust
Like foolish Prophets forth: their Words
to Scorn
Are scatter'd, and their Mouths are
stopt with Dust.

On the surface—and Omar's words are nearly always accepted at their surface value—it would seem that Omar did not think much of the words of the saints and sages, nor of the saints and sages. Another example of the folly of skimming through esoteric writings and relying on "impressions" to grasp their sense. Occult writers were adept at making statements *seem* to mean exactly the opposite of what they really did mean. We saw that very clearly in the "Muzzy Muezzin" stanza, discussed in the last installment.

So let us read the above quatrain again—carefully. And it should be recalled that one of the several systems of scriptural symbology—and the Rubaiyat is a scripture—is an ingenious method of masking secret teachings by plain, even naive, statements.

Reading the words carefully we note that Omar does *not* say that the saints and sages are foolish prophets. He says that they are thrust forth *like* foolish prophets—an entirely different matter. While he remarks that their words are scattered to scorn, he nowhere infers that he himself regards them with scorn; and while he observes that their mouths are stopped with dust, that is no more than a poetic reference to the fact that they are dead. But does not Omar *imply* that he identifies himself with the scorn expressed for the saints and sages by the ironic words "so learnedly"?

Esoteric writers imply nothing by the words they use that is not in the words themselves, except as these words veil the secret teaching they symbolize. Obvious implications, such as the apparently sarcastic "so learnedly," would be pointless in a symbolical passage. Read the words, therefore, entirely in their literal significance and what do we find?—That Omar is stating a profound but unhappy truth: The saints and sages with spiritual knowledge both of the seen and the unseen worlds always have been treated in just the way Omar describes. The Theosophical Society, laying claim to no saints, has certainly had its sages, who have suffered exactly the fate of Omar's foolish prophets. Perhaps Omar's lament was intended to be prophetic of the destiny of his own wise words. Sagacious as he was, the great Sufi must have well known the misunderstanding with which his en-

lightened teaching would be received. This stanza may well have been included in anticipation of it.

Omar has virtually been enthroned as a new Bacchus. A class of citizen for whom this abstemious court astronomer would have supreme contempt regards him as its patron saint. He has been created a sort of group soul of alcoholics—he who, as a Sufi, a Mohammedon Esotericist, would be forbidden by his vows to touch a drop of hard liquor. And had he not been a Sufi but only an exoteric Mohammedan, he still would have been prohibited by the laws of the Prophet from imbibing.

One of the saints covered by Omar's generalization made the same observation in unequivocal language. The saint was Paul and the words are:

"The natural" (material) "man receiveth not the things of God for they are foolishness unto him."

Foolishness today as they were two thousand and one thousand years ago. Things of God then as they are today. Perhaps this should console the Theosophists, if they need any consolation, for the way in which their own philosophy—surely the things of God—are received by the "natural" public. We are regarded as foolish prophets, our words to scorn are scattered and—give us time—our mouths will be stopped with dust.

It will not always be so.

(To Be Continued)

"ONLY THE CREDULOUS . . ."

(See May 1952 ANCIENT WISDOM for explanation of the above caption.)

RALPH WALDO EMERSON

We must infer our destiny from the preparation. We are driven by instinct to have innumerable experiences which are of no visible value, and we may revolve through many lives before we shall assimilate or exhaust them. Now there is nothing in nature capricious, or whimsical, or accidental, or unsupported. Nature never moves by jumps, but always in steady and supported advances . . . If there is the desire to live, and in larger sphere, with more knowledge and power, it is because life and power are good for us, and we are the natural depositories of these gifts. The love of life is out of all proportion to the value set on a single day, and seems to indicate a conviction of immense resources and possibilities proper to us, on which we have never drawn. All the comfort I have found teaches me to confide that I shall not have less in times and places that I do not yet know.

THE ZODIAC IN "QUOTES"

Aquarius

I was a man who had many friends
And many friends had me.

—John Bennett

DO YOU KNOW?—

That many misconceptions exist among newer students of Theosophy as to what is meant by *karma*?

* * *

That karma is not an entity but a great natural law—the word itself meaning in Sanskrit, *action*?

* * *

That while this is its root-meaning, karma signifies to the occultist much more than mere action, its implications being so far-reaching that no single English word can convey them?

* * *

That this is the reason Theosophists employ the word so frequently, and not the desire to use a Sanskrit term merely to be "different"?

* * *

That other Sanskrit words such as *dharma*, *manvantara*, *chela*, *guru*, *prana*, *maya*, *tattva*, etc., are utilized for like reasons?

* * *

That Sanskrit is a language better adapted to express abstract ideas, such as those with which Theosophy deals, than perhaps any other in the world?

* * *

That while rough translations of each word are possible, the delicate shades of meaning the original conveys can often be indicated only by several words, a whole sentence or even a paragraph?

* * *

That *karma*, for example, cannot be comprehended by regarding it merely as *action*?

* * *

That while action is at the root of all karma, the word also signifies *re-action*, cause and effect, balance and imbalance, deficiencies and their correction?

* * *

That *karma* does *not* mean rewards and punishment, wrath of God, evil occurrences, bad luck, or similar crudities, though outwardly it may sometimes appear to act that way?

* * *

That while everything that happens is karma, and therefore the *appearance* would seem to justify application of the term, the last thing a Theosophist should do is to judge by appearances?

* * *

That the very essence of Theosophy (at least as we see it) is to penetrate to the heart of every manifested happening, disregarding irrelevant superficialities?

The technique of trying to sting an editor into making a reply by resorting to personal abuse or impertinence is a very old one. It is occasionally tried on us. Our answer?—A capacious waste basket.

OCCULTISM IN THE BIBLE

Stop Thief!

By CHARLES E. LUNTZ

The poignant mental torture inflicted on a man by the subtle means of imprisoning members of his family who have done nothing to deserve it is not an invention of the Totalitarian governments. It is a device well known to the Ancients, and our friend Joseph was one of its able exponents. By way of preliminary experiment he had confiscated Brother Simeon, not one of the best loved members of the Jacobean household, perhaps, but still part of the family. He now had designs on Brother Benjamin, apple of his father's eye, and in the little plot he had conceived he well knew that he had pierced the brethren's collective Achilles heel.

There was nothing forbearing about Joseph. He had been mistreated by his brothers—largely because he was such a little smart aleck—and with what measure they had meted him he intended to mete them—good measure and running over. It is true he did not pursue his plot to the end and that afterwards he made fullest amends, but he carried it far enough to drive the unhappy sons of Jacob almost out of their minds with apprehension—and it is to their credit that their major concern was not for themselves but for their aged father who, if son Benny was not with them when they returned, would certainly drop dead on the spot.

With the morning light away rode the brethren, all unaware that in the sack of the youngest had been placed something that for them was more explosive than a stick of dynamite—my lord's silver cup, evidently an article much prized by my lord, in view of the fuss made about it when it was discovered that it was gone.

Joseph himself gave the directions, saying to his steward "Up, follow after the men; and when thou dost overtake them, say unto them, wherefore have ye rewarded evil for good? Is not this it in which my lord drinketh, and whereby indeed he divineth? Ye have done evil in so doing."

The steward, who had himself been ordered to hide the cup in Benjamin's sack, probably thought his lord had gone slightly daft, but it would have been worth his job and possibly his life to raise any question. "And he overtook them," says the account. "and he spake unto them these same words." Strangely the Bible does not repeat the words as invariably it does at full length, when one person tells another what to say. We do not have to read them again. They were just "these same words."

One can imagine the indignant brethren, all talking at once and heatedly denying the accusation.

"And they said unto him, Wherefore saith my lord these words? God forbid

that thy servants should do according to this thing. Behold, the money which we found in our sacks' mouths we brought again unto thee out of the land of Canaan: how then should we steal out of thy lord's house silver and gold?"

Then, very indiscreetly, "With whomsoever of thy servants it be found, both let him die, and we also will be thy lord's bondsmen."

This last is undoubtedly the prize horrible example of saying the wrong thing at the wrong time.

"So be it" rejoined the steward grimly, "but I want only the one who has the cup—the rest of you shall be blameless."

The farce went on, with its conclusion foreordained. Beginning with the eldest each man's sack was searched and in that of the youngest—Benjamin—the precious cup was found. Naturally—as the steward himself had put it there.

"Then they rent their clothes, and laded every man his ass, and returned to the city."

Their unrecognized brother was waiting for them, all frills, flounces and stuffed shirt and ready with the appropriate tongue-lashing.

"What deed is this that ye have done? Wot ye not that such a man as I can certainly divine?"

Nothing modest or retiring about Joseph. "Such a man as I am!" We are surprised he did not say "AM certainly divine."

Judah, most outstanding of the brothers, now becomes sole spokesman for the group. The speech that follows is not only one of the most eloquent in the Bible but in any other piece of literature. Whoever composed it—and we don't think it was Judah—had an unsurpassed genius for joining words together so that they reflect supreme pathos, agonizing appeal and nameless anguish. Simple in language, it is touched with that moving spiritual quality with which the great writers of scripture somehow contrived to endow their outstanding masterpieces of expression.

And Joseph . . . but important as he was, he will have to wait for the next installment.

(To Be Continued)

Apropos of our recent paragraph regarding the view of the scientist who thinks humanity is not yet entitled to the designation *man* as yet, in which we suggested that perhaps it should be "Man, Whence How And Whither," a reader sends us a contrary opinion. He suggests that humanity has long since reached its prime and is now in a decaying condition so it should be "Man, Whence, How—And Wither."

Astrology is not a misleading fad. Astrology might be called the Soul of Astronomy.—C. W. Leadbeater.

Impracticable faith? Maybe. Yet faith is perhaps stronger than reality; faith itself creates reality.—M. Begin.

NO PROBLEM

(Continued from Page 91)

—this reincarnational numbers game could only be played in that way.

But nature is not so devoid of resource. She never makes anything hard that can be made easy and still achieve what she is after. There are always plenty of surplus Egos "in stock" on the higher planes and the "problem" of finding souls for bodies just aborning is therefore non-existent. Occultists declare, on authority of Eastern Adepts (and in this case "authority" is obviously the only source of information as there is no way of proving it except its logic and necessity) that sixty billion Egos are now in course of spiritual evolution in our present Chain of worlds.

About fifty-eight billion, therefore, or slightly less are not now in physical life. But they are alive just the same—more so than we are for they are functioning on planes that are nearer to Reality, though still far away from it in most cases. And as the period spent away from the earth is from several to many times the period spent upon it, the "mystery" begins to clear away. An evolved person who lives to be eighty might need 1200 or 1500 years in Devachan to absorb the fruits of a purposeful life here. Average man is said to stay away from 500 to 700 years. The short-lived return more quickly as they have less "absorbing" to do. There is also a period of a few years to many years spent on the astral plane, eliminating the deleterious accretions of earth life prior to passing on to the heaven world.

So that two billion bodies, if the number was stationary or approximately so, would accommodate perhaps ten times that number of Egos before the current crop of personalities, once dead, came back for more bodies. That would still leave some forty billion Egos for whom bodies would not be available.

What about them? Apparently we have a reverse problem here, and on a much greater scale. But not when the vaster reaches of the evolutionary cycle are understood. Spiritual evolution—from savage to Adept—covers aeons of time, hundreds of millions of years. Our present cycle or any cycle in which Egos reincarnate on earth is relatively small as compared with the huge framework in which it is taking place. Of the sixty billions going through it, we are informed that twenty billions will not make the grade, and at a point which is probably several million years away, will be dropped for awhile—"awhile" meaning until a new Scheme of evolution on a new planet catches up with their stage of development and they can go on from there. They will not suffer—they will not be "lost." They will lose a stupefying amount of time but will know nothing about it. When one is unconscious a lapse of one minute or one million years are both un-

realized—and the same would apply to one billion years. There is no sense of the passage of time. The loss of consciousness and the awakening seems to the one affected as though simultaneous.

But something will be going on within the depths of these "suspended" Egos during that long lapse, though they will not be aware of it. The non-absorption of experience and its transmutation into natural endowment can now be remedied. What was not done in the short cycle of devachanic sequences following on each of the many lives on earth can now be done in the immensely long cycle between "Chains." And done it always is. "The failures of one Chain are the leaders of the next." There is never a second failure.

So even to these backward children, nature is kind. And there are billions of them, carried over from the last Chain, still awaiting their first incarnation in this one, current evolution not yet having caught up with the point at which, in a great evolution, they were dropped out. It is not hard to account for the rest of the sixty billion when all of this is borne in mind.

Occult facts of this kind are to be found in theosophical literature, but are not often presented in magazines read by the general public. It is recognized that no matter how they may be simplified, these concepts are still rather overwhelming to those hearing of them for the first time. Yet preachers speak glibly of "eternity," which is a considerably longer time than the cycles referred to here. And astronomers deal in millions of light years, each one of which far outstrips the inter-chain period in which the failed Ego rests and recuperates. (A light year is the distance traversed by light traveling at a speed of approximately 186,000 miles per second. If any one is interested in working it out he will find this is about a hundred billion miles a year).

Nature seems prodigal of her time as of her space. Yet she uses both to subserve the needs of her children. And she is not to be confounded by a little matter of too many Egos—or not enough. To some, consideration of ideas and teachings such as this may seem fantastic and unless. But to others they are grand and inspiring concepts, declaring the glory and majesty of Creation and of Creation's God.

WHAT MAKES SENSE?

It Makes No Sense That—

Theosophists should ever permit themselves to lapse into a condition of placid reliance on those they may mistakenly believe to be "authorities," though every T. S. leader from Blavatsky on has repudiated such authority.

It Makes Sense That—

As even the wisest and most informed human being can know only a tiny fraction of what there is to know

on any subject, and as for very good reasons those who know most will often tell least, the words of no one are final authorities but only guides, helps and hints to one's own thinking.

* * * *

It Makes No Sense That—

Those who aspire to teach Theosophy to others should take the easy—and lazy—way of droning from a book with no original thought added . . . or permitted.

It Makes Sense That—

The teacher should strive always to inject fresh and vital ideas into the class study, especially endeavoring to show the practical value in everyday living of the truths presented.

* * * *

It Makes No Sense That—

Challenge or dissent should be sternly checked and the questioner in good faith be made to feel that he is a heretic who should be read out of the Society.

It Makes Sense That—

Earnest questions, doubts or even outright disagreement with the teacher or his "authorities," even if they be the Secret Doctrine or the Letters of the Masters, are entirely within the right of the oldest or the newest T. S. member.

* * * *

It Makes No Sense That—

Anyone should be denied a hearing to his objections if he wishes to state them and will do so courteously and without monopolizing too much time which should properly be devoted to other matters.

It Makes Sense That—

The ideas broached by new members may contain something of great value in reacting to occult truths which some of the older members may have so long taken for granted that they have not done much recent thinking about them.

* * * *

It Makes No Sense That—

As there was a time when the greatest theosophical leaders were, in this incarnation, new to the study of Theosophy, it should be assumed that a new member necessarily is a "young soul," who must mind his speech in the presence of the "old souls" who condescend to instruct him.

It Makes Sense That—

As no one (short of a highly developed clairvoyant) can know who is a "young" and who an "old soul," and the new member may in this respect far outrank the old one, such ridiculous and probably mythical distinctions should never even be mentioned by way of comparison of personalities.

* * * *

It Makes No Sense That—

We should make ourselves a laughing stock to the outside world by pretensions to soul antiquity that these very pretensions show we do not possess, the really advanced Ego being most modest and humble regarding his own virtues.

YOU'LL BE BACK

BY CHARLES E. LUNTZ

You may hold the grim conviction
That the "dead" are gone for keeps;
May accept the dreary fiction
That no son of man o'erleaps
Such a broad and deep hiatus
As must yawn for every mortal
When his now existing status
Ends with stagnancy aortal.

But regardless if that morrow
Seems attractive or reverse,
Or how many words you borrow
From the worldlings to asperse
Nature's law—Reincarnation—
It will never leave the track,
Nor be changed by legislation—
It will surely bring you back.

Back you'll come as man or woman,
Starting in as infant child;
Never beast but always human,
Newly born and newly styled.
Willy-nilly it's your dharma
And when signs of zodiac
Move around to fit your karma
You will certainly be back.

Better think about it, Mister,
For indeed it is your fate.
You'll be someone's brother, Sister,
Either soon or either late.
Coming back may change your gender
For the Ego is not sexed,
And this life's poor "Lost Weekender"
May stay sober in the next.

So rejoice that we'll be living
Many times upon this earth,
And to race-improvement giving
Our own modest two-bits' worth.
After centuries of resting,
Waiting on the almanac,
You'll be reborn unprotesting . . .
And delighted to be back.

TO ANCIENT WISDOM READERS

From the Healing Department
of St. Louis Lodge

SUBMITTED BY ELLA WELGE

Create in me a clean heart, O God;
And renew a right spirit within me.
—Psalms LI:10

Healing Thought: An understanding heart and a right mental attitude toward all forms and conditions of life tends to establish an inner and outer harmony which is healing to mind, body and affairs.

For the spiritual aid of the Healing Group of St. Louis Lodge write to the Group leader, Mrs. Ella Welge, care of the Society, 5108 Waterman Ave., St. Louis 8, Mo.

It Makes Sense That—

We have no doubt followed the line of occult study and enlightenment for many lives if we are earnest and sincere Theosophists, but we are not necessarily older or as old as Egos who have followed other valuable lines of endeavor which have enabled them to benefit the race.

WHY ABNORMAL PERSONALITIES?

(Continued from Page 89)

souls? This question should not be too hard to answer. A look at the case records as a whole, not individually, furnishes seemingly conclusive data. While the ignorant, stupid and brutish supply a goodly proportion of the most outrageous examples, there is a sufficiently heavy percentage among the intellectual class and even among those in other ways well ahead of their fellows, to negative the attempt to impute all abnormality to "baby souls."

This concession, however, may be made—that in respect to the abnormal condition, whatever it may be, the Ego is in *that regard* backward, no matter how advanced in other directions. This does not rule out the possibility of retrogression. Until a certain stage is reached any personality of an Ego may backslide, and doubtless often does, at least in some respects. The evolutionary tide does not consistently roll forward. It has its ebbs and flows like the tides of the sea—but its flows always at last exceed its ebbs and produce the end result envisioned by the Divine Intelligence that set it in motion.

In this series we are concerned first with the "ebbs." Not the usual ebbs that the average life may be expected to manifest, but with those phenomenal subsidences that leave the unhappy personality high and dry—a despairing wreck, a burden to himself and his family and an interesting, if gruesome, oddity for the case book of the psychiatrist.

What hope is there for the wretched creature who, for all his abnormality, is as much a child of God as the saintliest, and destined aeonically for Adeptship and Christhood as is the latter?

Before this question can be answered inquiry must be made as to how he came to fall into his present degraded condition. If he is an alcoholic to what prior life, if any, may this date back and why? And similarly with drug addiction, hardened criminality, exaggerated moral instability and the like. These must have originated somewhere and for some cause and at some specific period in the soul's long history. And as only excessive manifestations of these vices are under consideration, it is unlikely that they are the product of a single life.

The facile expedient of attributing possession of all the abilities and virtues to the mature and the deficiencies and obliquities to the immature will not work. Savages are obviously young souls yet their skills in certain directions far exceed the similar accomplishments of most of the civilized and in some aborigines the moral sense appears much more developed than in many members of the *intelligentsia*. Indeed drunkenness and immorality have been virtually unknown among some of the "backward" races until the "civilizing" influence of western

culture and religion took them in hand. These and similar puzzling factors cannot be ignored if a correct solution is to be reached of the difficult problems toward which this exploration is directed.

(To Be Continued)

MEAT-EATING AND THE GROUP SOUL

(Continued from Page 89)

misery in the world is found. Not only of disease and suffering but also the underlying cause of much insanity, criminality and war. Evolution is tremendously retarded by the eating of wrong food because when the physical body is affected and our bloodstream and lymphatic system is overloaded with toxins, catarrh and high acidosis, the mentality is affected as a natural consequence.

It is plain that the truth is on the side of the vegetarians and all the Theosophists ought to come to our side, the side of commonsense.

* * * *

The Editor's Reply to Dr. Koopman

Your letter of October 4th was not unexpected. I was sure that Mr. Anderson's article would arouse considerable resistance, but I just want to point out that nowhere in the article does the author approve of meat-eating. That is not the purpose of his argument at all. It is a mere exploration to try to determine, just from the standpoint of logic and the justice of God, whether there can be any compensatory result to the animal for the constant violent deaths the personalities of its group soul experience.

This, I think, is a legitimate object of inquiry. The justice of God, if not the justice of man, should certainly extend to the animal kingdom; and while this in no way excuses man for the tortures inflicted on the animal, it assuredly is commendable to try to understand how the animal group soul would be "reimbursed," so to speak, for having to undergo these constant torments.

Now surely no criticism attaches to such an inquiry. Suppose we leave out the question of the killing of animals for food by human beings and merely inquire into the reason why virtually every animal in the wild state eventually suffers a violent death at the hands or claws of some other animal. There would still remain the search for a reason as nature, which is God in action, permits this.

And if a reason exists for the killing of animals by each other and some ultimate good inures to the group soul in consequence, as surely it must in common justice, then similar good must come if the inquiry is extended to the killing of animals by human beings for food, in sport or even in vivisection. This is simply a logical followup, but it does not in any way justify the killers, and that is not the purpose of the article or of our printing it.

I can understand your objections to some of Mr. Anderson's points as to the

raising of cattle, etc., specifically for human consumption. I am going to publish parts of your letter and give Mr. Anderson the chance, if he wishes, to answer them—and you to answer him, if you desire.

But I do want you clearly to understand that neither ANCIENT WISDOM nor Mr. Anderson are attempting to justify meat-eating, though we refrain from condemning this because of the very large number of readers who are not vegetarians and who would take strong exception to our doing so. I never have been able to see that there was any point in driving away newly joined Theosophists or prospective Theosophists interested in the philosophy, who were not yet ready for vegetarianism. What good do we do ourselves by this? We don't convert them into vegetarians but we do very likely offend them and kill their budding interest in the philosophy. The Society would be deprived of some excellent hard-working members if it were closed to all but vegetarians. We are not ready for that yet—our numbers are too scanty.

All of which is no rebuttal of the arguments you use but simply a realistic facing of facts—that the vegetarian cause must be advanced with great diplomacy and tact if it is to gain headway, and that not an iota of advantage is gained by driving so hard on the subject that the non-vegetarians are offended and feel insulted, without in any way responding to our well meant attempts to change their eating habits.

You are so broad minded and logical in all of your thinking that I am sure you will agree, in spite of your own profound convictions on this important subject.

* * * *

Other comments received both attack and approve Mr. Anderson's article. ANCIENT WISDOM hews strictly to the line it has always followed, in this and all other matters pertaining to the beliefs or to the personal practices of T. S. members. *These are their own business*—not our business nor the business of anyone else. Be a vegetarian by all means if you decide it is good for you, or for that matter if you decide that it isn't. It is *your* decision, *your* life, *your* karma. And no one, in the Society or out, has the least right to dictate what you shall do. That, as we understand it, is Theosophy.

THE THREE QUALITIES AND THE PATH

(Continued from Page 89)

MENTAL: Thinking and thoughts.

EMOTIONAL: Feeling towards objects.

PHYSICAL: Body.

A common mistake is to suppose that progress on the "Path" consists of "developing the higher principles." It is often assumed that we usually have plenty of body, plenty of emotions, a moderate amount of mentality, weak

A HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FIVE FORMER
ISSUES OF ANCIENT WISDOM ARE STILL IN PRINT

★ ★ ★ ★

Since the first number in March 1935 ANCIENT WISDOM has published 216 issues. An extra supply of each is always printed as readers constantly request earlier numbers. Some of them are in consequence no longer available—most of them are. We believe that if our newer readers were aware of the wealth of fascinating occult subjects these prior issues contain, not one of them would longer be available.

Let us tell you about what some of these subjects cover—and we can mention only a tiny fraction of them here: THEOSOPHY AND ORTHODOX CHRISTIANITY; PERSONAL PROBLEMS THEOSOPHICALLY SOLVED; HAPPINESS, WHENCE, HOW AND WHITHER; THE EGO SPEAKS IN DREAMS; THEOSOPHY AND THE CHURCHES; THEOSOPHY AND CHRISTIAN SCIENCE; WHO MADE ME? (A Child's Questions Theosophically Answered); SUPERSTITIONS: THEY WORK SOMETIMES; WHAT IS MORALITY?; ROMAN CATHOLICS AND THEOSOPHY; DHARMA: THE "MUST LIST OF THE EGO." All these are series.

In addition to the Series articles, of which there are many more than those listed above, there are literally thousands of single articles, constituting virtually a complete primary occult education invaluable as a background for more advanced study.

SPECIAL PRICES
ON QUANTITIES

Single Copies	.20 each
1 doz. Issues	2.00
2 doz. Issues	3.50
50 Issues	6.00
100 Issues	9.00
The entire 185	12.00

We pay postage

Order from:
ANCIENT WISDOM PRESS, 320 Merchants' Exchange Bldg.,
St. Louis, Mo.

ethical inclinations and a trace of spirituality. We are not "all there." In addition this gives a tendency to despise the physical body, the emotions, and even to some extent the mentality.

The real trouble is quite different. We are equipped with all the five principles from the beginning of our human career. The trouble is *tamas* or *rajas*, as the case may be. The business of the "Path" is as simple as this: just review your five "principles" every day, one by one, in the light of *sattwa*. Then you will not need an occult school or teacher; you will see that the craving for a school or teacher is either a piece of *tamas* or a piece of *rajas*. You will be able to decide for yourself what to fill your mind with as well as what to eat, and there will be no need for secrecy in the former any more than in the latter.

"But what about our psychic development?" some will ask. The answer is that it will take care of itself. Each "principle" has a sphere of operations

—its own "plane." When it becomes *sattwic* it will be organized and will operate. For example, when the emotions are *sattwic* there will be orderly work on the astral plane, whether it is remembered on the physical plane or not. While they are not *sattwic* there will be either lazy dreaminess or disorderly plunging about on the astral plane during the sleep of the physical body. To seek to have the memory of astral experiences or consciously to use astral powers at the same time as the physical, in the physical waking state before attaining considerable emotional *sattwa*, is certainly most dangerous and contrary to the "Path."

Another thing to be understood is that "transmutation" is always lateral or horizontal. There is no transfer of "forces" from one plane to another, either up or down. Transmutation is from *tamasic* or *rajasic* to *sattwic* in the forces of each level.

Then comes the question of Masters. You do not need an Adept from the

ethical or spiritual plane to advise you about what kind of eating or exercise is good for the physical body. We have the right sort of companionship on the physical plane for that. Similarly, the *companionship* of every plane will take care of itself, and we shall have the *companionship* of the Masters on the "ethical" plane as we become *sattwic* in that respect. It will be the "masterness" of the Masters that we shall seek and find, not the manness of them—meaning their mere physical or emotional principles. One will not then be a cat looking at a king, and not knowing what a king is, but a progressing *chela* (apprentice) looking at a Master and having that companionship.

To be sunk in desire for physical sensations, and uninterested in the other principles is a low stage of human achievement, against which men have been many times warned. It is called "*bhoga*" in the Gita. Again, to be whirled about in personal ambition is also deprecated; this is "*aishwarya*." Still, the latter is better than the former. It is on the way. Each leads to pain and trouble, and that will make one think, and seek, and find the truth, the *sattwa*.

It will be seen that the appropriateness (*sattwa*) of everything is important. For example, the physical body should not be over-sensitive physically. It should be appropriate to the kind of life one has to lead. Physical sensitivity should not be confused with ability to remember astral experiences or to respond to the telepathic feelings and thoughts of others. The *sattwic* condition of the body is best for the harmonizing and writing of the gains of all planes.

Curiosity has also been disapproved because it is not concerned with *sattwa*.

Chelas are also taught not to seek to do any work which others can do, or can be got to do, well enough. For instance, I, the writer of this, ought not to seek to get articles into papers or get books published and sold or give lectures or hold classes anywhere if there are others available to do the job sufficiently and well enough. That would be *aishwarya*.

It all boils down to this; the simple union is best, but it must be union expressed in harmony.

MINSTRELSY

A Selection From The
Poems of Patience Worth

Laughter

The sword of day; the coin of fellowship
The key to heaven, egad!
I say me the key to heaven,
For he who laughs truly may hold
No secret vice within his heart.
He who laughs must needs lift his head
And know his God—if he laughs well.

Whate'er we leave to God, God does
and blesses us.
—Thoreau.